

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 28-48 are pending in the application, with claims 28 and 31 being independent claims. Claims 28 and 31 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original specification at least at paragraphs [0045 – 0050], paragraph [0026] and Figure 1. No new matter has been added.

§103 REJECTIONS

A. Claims 28-31 and 33-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,276,731 to Arbel et al. (hereinafter “Arbel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,026 to Pershan et al. (hereinafter “Pershan”) and further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,386 to Rogers et al. (hereinafter “Rogers”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, independent claims 28 and 31 have been amended for clarification and are, therefore, believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 28, as presently amended, recites in part:

a selective call forwarding system, comprising:

a telephone system configured to receive at least one call made from one of a plurality of preferred caller telephone numbers to a subscriber telephone number, and to selectively forward the call to

a one of a plurality of forwarding telephone numbers associated with the subscriber telephone number,

...

wherein the telephone system uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers** on a call to the subscriber telephone number,

wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to triggers, and

wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data

Additionally, **independent claim 31**, as currently amended, recites in part:

a method, comprising:

providing a programmable telephone number table comprising a subscriber telephone number, a plurality of forwarding telephone numbers, and a plurality of preferred caller telephone numbers associated with a subscriber telephone number,

...

wherein the first call and the second call made to the subscriber telephone number are made on a telephone system that uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers**,

wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to triggers,

wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data

Applicant respectfully submits that Arbel, Pershan and Rogers, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 28 or independent claim 31.

References Fail to Teach or Suggest a Telephone System using T_No_Answer and T_Busy triggers, or Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol to respond to triggers, and the Telephone System uses a Flow Through Provisioning System to pass data.

Applicant understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that independent claims 28 and 31, amended as discussed during the interview, appeared to distinguish over the prior art of record. Applicant herein amends independent claims 28 and 31 for clarification as discussed during the interview. In particular, Applicant amends claim 28 to recite “the telephone system uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers** on a call to the subscriber telephone number, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, and wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data.” Also, Applicant amends claim 31 to recite “a telephone system that uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data.” Accordingly, independent claims 28 and 31 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Arbel is directed towards handling of incoming telephone calls, including delivering predetermined messages to predetermined calling parties; prioritized screening of incoming telephone calls; and re-routing incoming telephone calls on the basis of predetermined selection criteria (Arbel, Abstract).

However, Arbel fails to teach or suggest “the telephone system uses

T_No_Answer and **T_Busy triggers** on a call to the subscriber telephone number, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, and wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data” as recited by independent claim 28, or “a telephone system that uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data” as recited by independent claim 31. Accordingly, neither independent claim 28, nor independent claim 31 is taught or suggested by Arbel.

Pershan fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Arbel. Pershan is directed towards call forwarding services and next event list messages, including optional notification of forwarded calls (Pershan, col. 3, lines 19-21). The service subscriber in Pershan can update call forwarding service information stored at, e.g., a service control point, by calling an interactive voice response system or through the use of a personal computer with a web browser application (Pershan, col. 3, lines 33-37).

However, Pershan fails to teach or suggest “the telephone system uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers** on a call to the subscriber telephone number, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, and wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 28, or “a telephone system that uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol**

to respond to **triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 31. Accordingly, Pershan fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Arbel, as Pershan fails to teach or suggest the features recited by independent claims 28 and 31.

Rogers does not compensate for the deficiencies of Arbel and Pershan. Rogers is directed towards a call management system with call control from user workstation computers via a digital data network (Rogers, Abstract). The system of Rogers enables the called party to know who is calling before the call is accepted and, thus, to establish the likely priority of the call and decide how best to handle the call before his telephone rings (Rogers, col. 1, lines 50-53). The call management computer receives and answers all calls from the telephone provider’s central office (Rogers, col. 2, lines 4-5).

However, Rogers fails to teach or suggest “the telephone system uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers** on a call to the subscriber telephone number, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, and wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data” as recited by independent claim 28, or “a telephone system that uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) protocol** to respond to **triggers**, wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data” as recited by independent claim 31. Accordingly, Rogers fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Arbel or Pershan, as Rogers fails to teach or suggest the features recited by independent claims 28 and 31.

Thus, Arbel, Pershan and Rogers, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least these features of independent claims 28 and 31. Therefore, independent claims 28 and 31 are believed to be allowable, for at least these reasons.

Dependent claims 29-30 depend from independent claim 28, and **dependent claims 33-48** depend from independent claim 31. They are, therefore, allowable by virtue of this dependency as well as for additional features that each recites.

For example, dependent claim 38 recites “wherein the indication [that the call is being forwarded to the forwarding telephone number] provided to the caller [of the subscriber number] is a lamp.” Arbel, Pershan and Rogers, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this feature of dependent claim 38. Thus, dependent claim 38 is believed to be allowable for at least these additional reasons.

B. Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Arbel, Pershan, Rogers, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,864 to O’Neil et al. (hereinafter “O’Neil”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 32 depends from independent claim 31 and is, therefore, allowable by virtue of this dependency as well as for additional features that it recites.

O’Neil does not compensate for the deficiencies of Arbel, Pershan, and Rogers. O’Neil is directed to a method and system for providing a telecommunication extension service (O’Neil, Abstract). This service provides ringing to both units of a two unit set, upon receipt of a communication directed to one of the two units (Id.). A party may

answer either one of the two units, or both units, providing for the possibility of a conference call between the caller, and the parties answering each of the two units (Id.).

However, O'Neil fails to teach or suggest "a telephone system that uses **T_No_Answer** and **T_Busy** triggers, wherein the telephone system uses a **Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP)** protocol to respond to triggers, wherein the telephone system uses a **flow through provisioning** system to pass data" as recited by incorporation from independent claim 31, by dependent claim 32. Accordingly, O'Neil fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Arbel, Pershan, or Rogers, as O'Neil fails to teach or suggest the features recited by dependent claim 32.

Thus, Arbel, Pershan, Rogers and O'Neil, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least these features of dependent claim 32. Dependent claim 32 is believed allowable for at least these reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 28-48 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 16, 2007

By: 
Patrick D.S. Reed
Lee & Hayes, pllc
Reg. No. 61,227
(509) 324-9256 ext. 252